

MAR 31 1925

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 19

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1925

WHOLE No. 496



Columbia University

In the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION

July 6 to August 14, 1925



Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different Schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

GREEK

Elementary Course (= Entrance Greek a)
Professor Eugene Tavenner

Xenophon (= Entrance Greek b)
Professor Eugene Tavenner

Euripides

(College Course)
Professor Clinton W. Keyes

LATIN

Elementary Course (For Beginners)
Mr. Irving C. Demarest

Caesar, Gallic War (= Entrance Latin 3)
Professor Clinton W. Keyes

Vergil, Aeneid (= Entrance Latin 5)
Mr. Irving C. Demarest

Cicero: Intensive Study (= Entrance Latin 4)
Dr. John E. Barss

Cicero: Selected Orations (= Entrance Latin 4)
Dr. John E. Barss

Prose Composition (= Entrance Latin 6)
Dr. John E. Barss

Prose Composition (For Teachers)
Professor Hubert M. Poteat

Livy (College Course)
Professor Frank H. Cowles

The Odes of Horace (College Course)
Professor William S. Messer

Prose Composition (For the A.M. degree)
Professor Charles Knapp

Vergil, Aeneid (Advanced Course)
Professor Charles Knapp

Roman Comedy: Plautus and Terence
Professor William S. Messer

Cicero's Letters Professor Hubert M. Poteat

The Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, Vergil
Professor Frank H. Cowles

Teaching Latin in Secondary Schools
Miss Frances E. Sabin

Demonstration Class in Beginning Latin
Miss Frances E. Sabin

ANCIENT HISTORY

Ancient History (General Course)

Political and Cultural History of Greece
Professor William L. Westermann

Mr. Thomas P. Peardon

Mediterranean World under Roman Control
Professor William L. Westermann

PUBLIC LECTURES ON GREEK AND LATIN SUBJECTS

For Announcement of Summer Session of 1925, Address the
Secretary of Columbia University, New York City

Maps and Map Exercises

*that would have made Alexander the Great himself
sit up and take notice*

Bishop and Robinson's Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in Ancient History

Bishop and Robinson's Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in Medieval and
Modern European History

Bishop and Robinson's Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in European
History to 1714

Bishop and Robinson's Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in European
History since 1714

Willard and Robinson's Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in General
History

Willard and Robinson's Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in English
History

Bishop and Robinson's Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in American
History

Ginn and Company

Boston

New York

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

Columbus

San Francisco

The Teaching of Latin Composition

in

Place's Second Year Latin

THIS book gives, through its "Training Camp" and its "Suggestions for Study", real *power* in Latin Composition. The instruction firmly establishes the following three essentials:

1. An accurate knowledge of the inflections;
2. The mastery of a definite vocabulary of carefully selected words;
3. A real understanding of the more important principles of syntax.

Place's Second Year Latin

By Perley Oakland Place, Litt.D.

Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

576 pages

Richly illustrated

Price, \$1.68

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 19

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1925

WHOLE NO. 496

SOME APPEARANCES OF THE DIDO STORY¹

The earliest extant reference to the connection of Dido and Carthage in ancient literature occurs in Timaeus of Tauromenium (circ. 345–250 B.C.). This pedant² lived in the latter half of the fourth and the first half of the third century before Christ and wrote a history of Sicily. He refers to Dido as Theiosso and says she was called Elissa in the language of the Phoenicians³. Her brother, Pygmalion, the king of Tyre, killed her husband to secure his treasures, whereupon she fled to Libya and received the name Dido from her wanderings. The king of the Libyans made rather vigorous proposals of marriage, which she scorned, and, wishing to relieve herself of her troubles, she committed suicide on a pyre which she had ordered to be prepared. There is no mention of Aeneas or of his arrival in connection with her story.

Naevius (circ. 269–199 B.C.) wrote an epic, the *Bellum Punicum*, from which Vergil borrowed, as Macrobius⁴ and the interpolator of Servius⁵ assure us. It would seem quite likely that in such a work there would be some allusions to Dido as the founder of Carthage or to the Dido-Aeneas story, if such a tradition existed. But in the extant fragments of this epic there is no certain reference to either, although we read in Servius⁶ that Anna and Dido appeared as sisters in Naevius. There is, however, one fragment about which much discussion has been aroused⁷:

Blande et docte percontat Aeneas quo pacto
Troiam urbem liquerit. . . .

Nonius Marcellus, of the fourth century A.D., gives us this fragment twice⁸, in his "Dictionary of Republican Latin", to illustrate uses of *linquo* and *percontor*. There are a number of readings, but, even if we accept the reading just given and admit that Aeneas is the subject of *liquerit*, we have absolutely no proof that Dido is the subject of *percontat*; in other words, we have no proof here that Dido appeared in Naevius in any scene with Aeneas or that the two names were linked in any way. Perhaps Naevius did tell of the meeting of Dido and Aeneas; perhaps he did paint the queen as a hated Carthaginian. But all this is conjecture⁹.

It seems almost unthinkable that Vergil would have brought the Dido episode into the *Aeneid* as an invention of his own. In a work of this sort such an episode might have been too daring were there not some well-established tradition to warrant it, a tradition appearing in sources of which we have never had any knowledge. But there really is no extant reference that gives positive evidence of such a tradition.

In Ennius (239–169 B.C.) we have an allusion to Dido as the founder of the Carthaginian state: . . . *Poenos Didone oriundos*¹⁰. Solinus (of the third century A.D.), in his *Collection of Things Worth Remembering*¹¹, gives us another pre-Vergilian reference to Dido. He makes Cato¹² authority for the statement that the Phoenician Elissa founded Carthage and that it was first called Carthada, a name meaning 'New Town', in the language of the Phoenicians¹³.

Of course, if we are to make Servius and all that we read there the rock of our faith, we must believe in the existence of a Carthage-Aeneas tradition before the *Aeneid* was written. In Servius's commentary on *Aeneid* 4.9 we learn that Anna appeared in Naevius as Dido's sister. Servius's interpolator declares, on 4.682, that the most learned Roman of his times, Marcus Terentius Varro (116–27 B.C.), said that it was not Dido, but Anna, who sacrificed herself on the pyre because of her love for Aeneas¹⁴. This really seems important. Heinze¹⁵ suggests that perhaps Varro wished to reconcile different versions of the Dido story. At all events, if we can accept this, we need no longer doubt the existence of some sort of pre-Vergilian tradition associating Aeneas with Carthage.

Before we turn from Vergil's predecessors let us recall that Macrobius¹⁶ and Servius¹⁷ point out that *Aeneid* 4 was greatly influenced by the fourth book of the *Argonautica*, a Greek epic by the Alexandrian poet, Apollonius Rhodius (born circ. 280 B.C.). Here we read the tragic love-story of Jason and Medea, many of the details of which seem to have been transferred to the Dido-Aeneas story. The *Argonautica*, which was translated into Latin by Varro Atacinus about 45 B.C., was probably used by Vergil, by Ovid, in his *Heroides*, and also by Valerius Flaccus, in his own *Argonautica*. "The Medea of Apollonius is the direct precursor of the Dido of Virgil, and it is the pathos and passion of the fourth book of the *Aeneid* that keep alive many a passage of Apollonius", says

¹⁰*Annales* 290 (in Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae* [Teubner, Leipzig, 1903]).

¹¹*Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium* 27.10.

¹²His words are: ut Cato in oratione senatoria autumat.

¹³Compare also Servius on *Aeneid* 1.366: Carthago enim est lingua Poenorum nova civitas, ut docet Livius.

¹⁴Compare also Servius on *Aeneid* 5.4. ¹⁵*Virgils Epische Technik*, 113, note.

¹⁶*Saturnalia* 5.17.4. ¹⁷On *Aeneid* 4.1.

¹This paper was read at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the Episcopal Academy, Overbrook, Pennsylvania, May 3, 1924.

²Compare Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 4; Cicero, *De Oratore* 2.14. Polybius censures him severely in several places.

³Franciscus Goller, *De Situ et Origine Syracusarum*, 250 (Leipzig, 1818).

⁴*Saturnalia* 6.2.31. ⁵On *Aeneid* 1.198. ⁶On *Aeneid* 4.9.

⁷See Ernst Diehl, *Poetarum Romanorum Veterum Reliquiae*, Naevius, Frag. 14 (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1911).

⁸*De Compendiosa Doctrina* 335, 474.

⁹For a recent discussion of this fragment, by Professor Knapp, see *The Classical Journal* 19.202–203 (January, 1924).—For the contrast between Vergil's treatment of the Dido story and the version of that story current before the *Aeneid* was written, see Professor Knapp, *The Classical Journal* 19.207.

Mr. R. C. Seaton¹⁸. This seems especially true of Dido's Hymn of Hate, beginning Aeneid 4.590, the germ of which appears in Apollonius 4.382-390. Many modern critics are of the opinion that the influence of Catullus has been strong upon Vergil in his treatment of the Dido story. Other antecedents of importance were the Greek tragedy with its conflict of character, especially Euripides, and the Alexandrian poetry which used the love motive¹⁹. Nor ought we to forget Gallus, for whom his teacher Parthenius, who also taught Vergil, made a handbook of love-tales.

Next we turn to Vergil's contemporaries and successors. Strabo, who was about forty years old when Vergil died, tells us, in his Geography²⁰, that Carthage was founded by Dido, who came from Tyre. Her people in time gained possession of practically the whole of Africa. 'From the power they acquired they raised a city to rival Rome, and waged three great wars against her. Their power became most conspicuous in the last war, in which they were vanquished by Scipio Aemilianus, and their city was totally destroyed'.

In Livy's time, shortly after the death of Vergil, there lived an historian named Pompeius Trogus. Some men throw themselves into vast undertakings. Trogus was such a man, for he attempted a universal history in forty-four books. He gave the histories of the nations with which Rome had had contact. Perhaps his work was a translation of a work by Timagenes of Alexandria, who came to Rome in the time of the Civil Wars. At any rate, Trogus did little more than translate some Greek originals. We have epitomes of Trogus's work, and also an important abridgement of it made by Justinus, similar to that of Livy made by Florus. This faithful abbreviator, Marcus Junianus Justinus, lived in the second, or perhaps in the third, century of our era. His account of Dido²¹ probably goes back ultimately to one which antedates or is contemporary with the composition of the Aeneid.

In Justinus's story, Dido's father, the Tyrian king, is called Mutgo. After his death the people gave the government to his son, Pygmalion, and his daughter, Elissa, married her uncle, Acerbas. Some time later Pygmalion murdered Acerbas to gain possession of his secret treasures. Elissa pretended to prepare to live with Pygmalion, but really made preparations to leave the country. She enlisted among her followers some of her brother's own servants and some dissatisfied members of the Tyrian nobility. These sailed away with her secretly. They first stopped at the island of Cyprus, where they were joined by a priest of Zeus and his family; before they left, they carried off by force eighty young women as wives for the emigrants. His mother, as well as the threats of the gods, prevented Pygmalion from pursuing Dido. After she had safely landed in Africa, we have the episode of the purchase of land with the hide of the bull. Justinus says that

Dido bought the amount of ground *qui corio bovis legi posset*. The word *legi* seems strange here. Vergil says more properly *laurino quantum possent circumdare tergo*²². The place was called Byrsa, from βύρσα, the hide of a bull. The colony prospered and grew; the town of Carthage was built; and annual tribute was paid to the Libyans. While the foundations of the new city were being dug, a bull's head was found. The site was therefore changed, since it was believed that the head of the bull foretold that, despite its future wealth, the city would always be enslaved. On the new site the head of a horse was found. This was accepted as a favorable omen²³.

When Carthage had become too prosperous to please the jealous king Iarbas, or Hiabas, he summoned to him ten of the nobility of the Carthaginians and demanded Elissa in marriage, threatening war if he should be refused. The representatives, who were afraid to carry this message to the queen, treated her with Carthaginian deceit, saying that the king was looking for some one to teach the manners of civilization to himself and his people, but that no one could be found willing to leave his relatives and go among barbarians living like wild beasts. After being rebuked by the queen, who said that a citizen ought to be willing to give his very life if his country would thereby be served, they disclosed the king's demands, saying that 'she herself must do what she had enjoined upon others, if she wished her city to be secure'. Caught by this deceit, she called for a long time upon the name of Acerbas with tears and lamentations, but finally consented, and announced that 'she would go where her own fate and the fate of the city called her'. Elissa bided her time for three months. At the end of this period she erected a funeral pyre at the extremity of the city, and sacrificed many animals, as though to appease the shade of her husband. Then, with a sword in her hand she ascended the pyre, and, after telling the people that she was going to her husband as they had desired, killed herself.

Justinus assures us²⁴ that, as long as Carthage existed, Dido was worshipped there as a goddess. He also tells us that Carthage was founded 72 years before Rome. This brings us to a vital point, when we consider the fact that Vergil makes Dido and Aeneas contemporaries. There is, in fact, no general agreement among ancient historians as to when Carthage was founded. Orosius²⁵, like Justinus, places the founding of Carthage 72 years before the building of Rome. Velleius Paterculus²⁶ makes Carthage 65 years older than Rome; Servius²⁷ thinks it was 70 years older. The Epitome of Livy, Book 51, states that it stood 700 years, thus making it 93 years older than Rome. On the other hand, Appian²⁸ says that Carthage was founded 50 years before the fall of Troy, and in this he is in general agreement with Philistus²⁹. But Eusebius³⁰ says it was 143 years after the capture of Troy

¹⁸Introduction to his translation of Apollonius in the Loeb Classical Library, page xii. He compares passages such as Aen. 4.305-326 and Argonautica 4.355-390, Aen. 4.327-339 and Arg. 1.897-898, Aen. 4.522-532 and Arg. 3.744-765.

¹⁹Professor N. W. DeWitt's dissertation, *The Dido Episode in the Aeneid of Vergil* (Toronto, Wm. Briggs, 1907), treats at length these literary influences.

²⁰17.3.15. ²¹18.4-6.

²²Aeneid 1.368. Compare also Servius on Aeneid 1.367.

²³Compare Livy 1.55.5; Varro, *De Lingua Latina* 5.41.

²⁴18.6.8. ²⁵4.6. ²⁶1.6.4. ²⁷On Aeneid 1.267. ²⁸1.1.1.

²⁹Eusebius, *Hieronymi Chronica* 58.25 (edition of Helm [Leipzig, 1913]); = Eusebius, Volume 7).

³⁰*Ibidem*, 69.19.

that the African city was established. Josephus³¹ thinks Carthage was founded about a century and a half after the building of the temple of Solomon.

Some of these accounts would certainly not allow Dido and Aeneas to be contemporaries. Servius himself points out the anachronism³². Moreover, Macrobius³³, in referring to the popularity of the Dido story and its wide use by painters, sculptors, singers, and other artists, 'as though it were the only subject which had beauty', says that everybody knew the tale was false. There is an epigram in the Greek Anthology³⁴ on a painting of Dido which is interesting in this connection. It reads³⁵:

Thou seest, O stranger, the exact likeness of far-famed Dido, a portrait shining with divine beauty. Even so I was, but had not such a character as thou hearest, having gained fame rather for reputable things. For neither did I ever set eyes on Aeneas, nor did I reach Libya at the time of the sack of Troy, but to escape a forced marriage with Iarbas I plunged the two-edged sword into my heart. Ye Muses, why did ye arm chaste Vergil against me to slander thus falsely my virtue?

With some additions and modifications Ausonius³⁶ (circ. 310-395) has turned this into Latin. Most noteworthy are lines 5 and 6, which come after Dido's defense of her character: 'For neither did Trojan Aeneas ever see me nor did he ever reach Libya with his Ilian ships'.

It is interesting to note that Livy in 1.1 makes no mention of Carthage or Dido in connection with the wanderings of Aeneas (see J. R. Seeley, *Livy*, Book 1, pages 20-26). Ovid, on the other hand, takes over the whole story in *Heroides* 7, which, like the anonymous eighty-third poem³⁷ of Riese's *Anthologia Latina*³⁸, is an epistle from Dido to Aeneas written after the desertion. Moreover, Ovid shows complete acceptance of the story in *Amores* 2.18.25, 31; *Remedia Amoris* 57-58; and *Ars Amatoria* 3.39-42. Indeed, in the passage from the *Ars* we have something novel but thoroughly Ovidian:

Et famam pietatis habet tamen hospes et ensem
præbuit et causam mortis, Elissa, tuæ.
Quid vos perdiderit dicam: nescistis amare;
defuit ars vobis: arte perennat amor.

In *Tristia* 2.533 Ovid tells us that the Dido episode was one of the most popular parts of the *Aeneid*. In *Fasti* 3.523-636 Ovid identifies the goddess Anna Perenna, whose festival occurs on the Ides of March,

³¹Contra Apionem 1.18 (edition of Naber, Volume 6, [Teubner]).
³²On *Aeneid* 1.267: Sic autem omnia contra hanc historiam ficta sunt, ut illud ubi dicitur Aeneas vidisse Carthaginem, cum eam constet ante LXX annos urbis Romae conditam. Inter excidium vero Troiae et ortum urbis Romae anni inveniuntur CCCXL.

In his *Dialogues of the Dead*, Montaigne has Dido complaining to another spirit that she was misrepresented, and that Aeneas and she had not been contemporaries. The second spirit argues that both had been exiles in a foreign land, that one was a widow and the other a widower, that Vergil had reasons enough for bringing them together, that three hundred years were not the poet's concern, that, in matters of the heart, 'one must not judge by appearances; what is the least plausible in such circumstances is often the most true'.

³³Sat. 5.17.5. Dido is mentioned in other places also in Macrobius, e.g. 3.11.7. ³⁴16.151 (Planudian Anthology).

³⁵W. R. Paton, translation of the Greek Anthology (Loeb Classical Library), 5.249.

³⁶XXII, II, page 420, in the edition of Peiper (Teubner).

³⁷Edited, with Introduction, Translation, and Notes, by Miss Ethel L. Chubb (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.109-110).

³⁸See also No. 60 for a couplet alluding to Dido.

with Anna, the sister of Dido³⁹. Here the poet gives us a strange story. Anna, driven from her home by Iarbas, who seizes the palace after Dido's suicide, is shipwrecked on the shore of Laurentum. She happens to meet Aeneas and Achates strolling along the beach and is recognized by them. The hero makes excuses for his flight from Libya, and takes her to his home, where he introduces her to Lavinia with the following words:

'Lavinia, my wife, there is a dutiful reason why I should introduce this lady to you. When I was shipwrecked, I received her aid. Though originally from Tyre, she possessed a kingdom on the Libyan shore. I beg that you will love her after the fashion of a dear sister'.

Lavinia is jealous of this woman brought into her house, especially when she sees her husband giving her many gifts, but she receives her guest graciously. Lavinia plans vengeance as her jealousy increases, but Anna flees from the house and drowns herself. And thus the triangle is broken.

Silius Italicus (25-101) frequently alludes to the Dido episode throughout the seventeen books of his *Punica*. Here we find almost every phase of the Vergilian story touched upon⁴⁰. Statius (circ. 40-95) refers to the Dido episode three times in his *Silvae*⁴¹. Tacitus (circ. 55-118), in his *Annals* 16.1-3, refers to a Carthaginian treasure which Dido had wisely hidden in order that the new people might not grow wanton with excessive wealth, and that the African kings might not become envious and enter upon war. Both he and Suetonius⁴² tell us that Nero was encouraged in his extravagant spending by the hopes of recovering Dido's hidden treasure, which a Roman knight assured him still remained in some caverns in Africa. Needless to say, Nero had the same fortune as most persons with expectations of finding treasure hordes. Juvenal (circ. 53-135)⁴³ mentions as one of the intolerable members of her sex 'the woman who, as soon as she has reclined at table, praises Vergil, pardons the dying Elissa, matches and compares the poets, putting Vergil on one side of the balance and Homer on the other'.

Allusions to the Dido story occur in Lucian⁴⁴, Aulus Gellius⁴⁵, and Tertullian⁴⁶. Appian⁴⁷ says that founders of Carthage 'were either Zorus and Carchedon, or, as the Romans and the Carthaginians themselves think, Dido, a Tyrian woman', and then refers to the crime of Pygmalion, the flight of his sister, and the story of the purchase of land. Zenobia, one of the interesting women of history, claimed descent from Dido and imitated her dress⁴⁸. Ausonius, in his 'Cupid Crucified' 38, includes Dido among the love-lorn women who, as he says in his prose Preface, are

³⁹Silius Italicus (8.200-201) also refers to the worship of Anna as Perenna: ex illo primis anni celebrata diebus per totam Ausoniam venerando numine culta est.

⁴⁰See 1.21-25, 73-76, 81-82, 444-447; 2.406-425; 4.768-767; 6.312-315; 8.50-159; 11.597; 14.573; 15.746; 17.224. See Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 5.429, s. v. Dido.

⁴¹3.1.74-75; 4.2.1-4; 5.2.120. ⁴²Nero 31-32.

⁴³6.434-437. ⁴⁴De Saltatione 46. ⁴⁵9.9.14; 13.1.5.

⁴⁶Apology 50; Ad Martyras 4; Ad Nationes 1.18.

⁴⁷8.1.1.

⁴⁸Trebullius Pollio, *Tyranni Triginta* 27.1, 30.2.

'not those present-day lovers, who sin of their own free-will, but those heroic lovers who excuse themselves and blame the gods, some of whom our own Vergil mentions in his description of the Fields of Mourning'. An epigram, also formerly ascribed to Ausonius⁴⁹, runs thus:

Infelix Dido, nulli bene nupta marito:
hoc pereunte fugis, hoc fugiente peris.

Bringing our brief study to a close with the fourth century, we find references to Dido in Martianus Capella⁵⁰, in Claudian⁵¹, in Charisius⁵², who tells us that there was a discussion as to whether Aeneas had really loved Dido, and in Augustine's Confessions⁵³. The great Church Father admits the power of the story of Dido's death. There must have been more than one line in the Dido episode on which Vergil's own voice trembled as he read aloud⁵⁴. The voice of the many-sided Augustine must also have trembled on those same lines, for he tells us, great soul that he is, that he wept over Dido, *quia se occidit ob amorem*.
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA MERLE M. ODGERS

THE GRATITUDE OF THE GODS

That man should feel and express gratitude to god is a commonplace of religion, at least in its more advanced stages. That the gods owe gratitude to man is an idea that crops out here and there, more or less ambiguously, in the literature of the Greeks and the Romans. The ambiguity lies in the fact that gratitude is only one, and, in the nature of things, by no means the commonest, or the earliest, of the returns that man demands or expects for his worship.

The idea appears first with any approach to clearness in a well-known passage of Herodotus (1.87). Croesus is on the pyre. The Persian monarch has relented, and the Persians are making a vain effort to extinguish the flames. Croesus then calls upon Apollo to rescue him, 'if anything pleasing had come from him to the god as a gift'. The god responds with a shower of rain, which quenches the fire and saves the life of Croesus. The phrasology is evidently modelled on that of Homer, *Iliad* 1.39-41. Does Croesus claim gratitude? It is at least doubtful, for in Herodotus 1.90 he so bitterly accuses the Delphic god of ingratitude as almost to preclude the notion that he recognizes Apollo's gratitude in this deliverance. He requests permission to send his fetters to Delphi to the Greek god whom he particularly worships and to question him 'if it is his practice to deceive his benefactors'. He refers, of course, to the fatally ambiguous oracle by which he had been lured to stake and lose his kingdom. The hint of ingratitude contained in the words 'deceive his benefactors' is developed at the end of the chapter, where the messenger to Delphi is told to ask

'if it is the practice of the Grecian gods to be ungrateful'.

The contrast between Croesus's mental attitudes in these two chapters poses a problem. One would think his condition distinctly improved, by the direct intervention, too, of Apollo, the Delphic god. Why, then, should he charge Apollo with ingratitude? Why did he not make that charge when he was on the pyre? It may be said that then the peril was too imminent; it was a time to wheedle, not to reproach. This is probably the solution. The *χαπлевρα* to which Croesus refers are naturally taken to be the splendid gifts which he had sent to the Delphic god. But what, in fact, was their object? If they were gifts of propitiation, he would scarcely have the right to demand gratitude in addition to the safety which these gifts were intended to secure him. Presents made to an oracular deity before consultation may well have been intended to remove the danger of approaching the seat of an irascible chthonic deity, such as that whose site Apollo had taken over. There was certainly a considerable element of propitiation in the Delphic cult². But unnecessarily magnificent gifts, even of propitiation, may well have been thought likely to secure from the god something more than bare safety. We seem to be at a point from which gifts to an oracle are seen in either of two aspects, (1) as propitiation, for which only a negative return is expected, (2) as gifts, for which a positive return is hoped. *Ἰδοκερο* (Herodotus 1.50) suggests the former, *χαπлевρα* (1.87) the latter; *ἀχαπλοισι* (1.90) brings the latter idea into full prominence.

In the third poem of Bacchylides, Croesus lifts his eyes from the pyre to heaven, and cries (37-38), 'Deity of overpowering might, where is the gratitude of the gods?' I cannot think that the word *χαπλις* in this passage means only the 'grace' or the 'favor' of the gods. Jebb renders it by 'gratitude'. There is a claim implied, and that claim is granted³. We find at least an approximation to a similar idea in the treatise of Hippocrates called 'On Airs, Waters, and Places', 22: 'the gods rejoice at being honored and admired by men *καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων χάπλις ἀποδιδόσιν*'. Loew (*χαπλις* 4: a Marburg dissertation, 1908) warns us against importing into this passage the notion of thanks. 'They send us in return things to make us glad', he says, is all that the words need mean. But the whole terminology suggests thanks. It is a question whether *χαπλις ἀποδιδόσιν* or *χαπλις ἔχειν* is the commonest formula to express gratitude, and the preposition *ἀπὸ* is frequent in this use.

¹I follow Rawlinson in translating *ἀχαπλοισι* by 'ungrateful'. There can be no doubt that, though it is the stock word for this quality, it allows other meanings, relics of an earlier usage, when it meant nothing more than 'unpleasing'. In this sense it is found in *Odyssey* 8.236; *Xenophon, Oeconomicus* 7.37; *Plato, Laws* 935 A. *Menexenus* 248 C. I incline to the meaning 'ungracious' in *Euripides, Ion* 877, *Medea* 659, and, perhaps, in *Plato, Epp.* 7.335 B.

²In Herodotus 1.50 we read that 'Croesus sought with great sacrifices to propitiate the god at Delphi'. So, in 1.67, the Spartans send a sacred embassy to Delphi to ask which of the gods they were to propitiate in order to gain the upper hand in their war with the Tegeates. In the latter case, as often, the god is an expert in the lore of propitiatory sacrifice; in the former, he accepts it himself.

³Delos-born Apollo conveyed the old man to the country of the Hypoboreans (58-62), 'for his piety, because he had sent to divine Python the greatest gifts of all men'.

⁴⁹XXII, VIII, page 417, in the edition of Peiper (Teubner).

⁵⁰5.485. ⁵¹*Carmina Minora* 30.148.

⁵²See Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, I.167.

⁵³1.13.20-22.

⁵⁴Servius on *Aeneid* 4.323: *Dicitur autem ingenti affectu hos versus pronuntiasset, cum privatim paucis praesentibus recitaret Augusto*.

In Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae* 1228-1230, the chorus prays to the two goddesses in words which seem to mean, 'may the Thesmophorian goddesses in gratitude for our efforts grant us to receive the prize'. A comparison with *Pax* 760-761 will make it clear that the terminology of this passage is the terminology of gratitude⁴. Another instance in point we find in Plato, *Laws* 931 A. There we read that, though the statues of the gods are lifeless, yet we honor them, and we think that the gods "have a good will and gratitude to us on that account" (so Jowett renders, properly).

Here are at least four passages, culled from as many authors, in which we find the idea that the gods owe gratitude to man for acts of worship. There are, I believe, very few passages in which such an idea is expressed with any clearness. There is a somewhat dubious instance in *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum* 1.397. But there are numerous passages, in a series beginning with Homer, in which a favor is requested or demanded in consideration of worship rendered to the god. In *Iliad* 1.39-42 Chryses appeals to his god to punish the Greeks, 'if ever I have roofed a temple for thy delight, if ever I have burned fat thigh-pieces of bulls and goats'. This is not an unequivocal appeal to the gratitude of the god, but it opens with a formula which reappears in *Odyssey* 3.98-101, where Telemachus appeals to Nestor on the ground of his father's services to the Greek cause, in *Iliad* 22.82-84, where Hecuba shows her breast to her son and begs him to keep out of the fight, and in several instances where the gods appeal to one another's gratitude, e. g. *Iliad* 1.394-395, and the Hymn to Demeter 64-65.

A very similar formula is used in *Iliad* 15.372-376. Nestor prays, 'Father Zeus, if ever any of us did burn to thee fat thighs of bulls or sheep and prayed that he might return and thou didst promise and nod assent thereto, of these things be thou mindful and avert the pitiless day'. This is not quite the same as *Iliad* 1.39. A new element is introduced—the god's promise in past time. That promise might have been made in gratitude, but all that is asked now is honest fulfilment of the promise. Suppose that the object of that sacrifice in the past had been to atone for some sin or to avert evil. Its success is assured, for the god has promised relief, but why should he be grateful in addition? The worshiper has received the return which he demanded, or the promise of it. He cannot demand gratitude as well. In other words, propitiatory sacrifice does not inspire gratitude.

Such a place as *Iliad* 22.169-172, where Zeus expresses appreciation of the many sacrifices Hector has offered him, is still a step below gratitude. In *Iliad* 24.33-38, Apollo reproaches the gods with not rescuing the corpse of one who had 'burned fat thigh-pieces', but the specific charge which he makes is cruelty, not ingratitude.

Man wants appreciation and return for his worship. But he is content with pathetically little. Consider the situation in *Iliad* 24.425-428. Hector lies dead and his

body is daily dishonored. Hermes, despatched to put an end to this, tells his errand to Priam. 'Verily', cries the old king, 'verily it is a good thing to give due offering to the immortals, for never did my child forget in our halls the gods who inhabit Olympus. Therefore have they remembered this for him, albeit his portion is death'.

In the council of the gods with which the *Odyssey* opens, Athena asks why Zeus is angry at Odysseus, who had offered due sacrifices. One who had done his ritual duty should have attained the *pax deorum* and have nothing to fear from the gods. There is no necessary implication that they owe him gratitude⁵. In *Odyssey* 3.58-59, Athena, posing at Nestor's court as a mortal, prays Poseidon to grant Nestor and his people the fulfilment of their prayers, 'as a grateful return for the glorious hecatomb'.

The sacrifice is a *quo* for which god owes a *quid*. It is not as frankly a business relation as when the word *μισθός* is used, but the commercial element is as surely there as it lurks, unfortunately, in the blessed institution of Christmas presents. The man who gives a guest-gift expects to receive full value therefor (*Odyssey* 1.317), and the man who offers a gift to a god has a right to expect a return and to feel aggrieved if he fails to receive it. The question is whether, in that case, he thinks of his god as unjust, or whether he thinks of him as ungrateful—that is, whether the transaction is on a business basis or on a friendly basis.

Another aspect of the problem may be posed thus. Why, in the opinion of man, does the god make return to man? Is it because the deity is constrained by the act of sacrifice? Probably so, when the sacrifice is still on the plane of magic. Is it that the god is bound by a promise, implicit or explicit? That is, he may have accepted a rite of propitiation, or he may have nodded assent to a vow. Is it that he *ought* to do so, that justice demands it? Or is it that it pays him to do so and that the return is an act of enlightened self-interest? On this plane seems to be the plea of Orestes when he asks Zeus to protect him and his sister. He reminds the god that Agamemnon used to sacrifice to him and honored him greatly (Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 255-257). The idea seems to be the probability that the children of such a sire will follow his example⁷. Something of the same feeling is found in an inscription in which he who presents a gift to Athena prays that the goddess will give him the means to dedicate another.

Or, finally, does the god *want* to make return? Of course, these various motives overlap, especially when

⁴Is the use of *χαρίζεο* significant? It connotes the conferring of a favor, and ultimately, perhaps, the laying up of a store of gratitude.

⁵Here the word *μισθός* is interesting. It has a strong connotation of barter, and, to that extent, smacks of the commercial, as does *μισθός*. Compare *Odyssey* 1.317; Euripides, *Hercules Furens* 1169; Pindar, *Pythia* 2.24. The verb is used to express the return for a favor, in Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 728-729; the noun denotes an ungrateful return in Euripides, *Medea* 23. It becomes almost synonymous with *χάρις*: Theognis 1264; Euripides, *Orestes* 466; Democritus (?), *Diels, Fragmenta der Vorsokratiker*, 1.404, Frag. 92; Lucian, *Lucius* 27. Compare also Longus 2.3; Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae Praeter Atticas in Attica Repertae*, 20.62-64.

⁷Hebrew literature contains appeals to God to defend his worshippers for his reputation's sake ("for thy name's sake", *Psalms* 23.3; *Psalms* 74.10; 18.22; 89.50-51).

⁶Compare also Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea* 9.2 (1164 B, 31); Thucydides 3.63, 67; Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazousae* 1047-1048.

we are discussing justice and gratitude. In Aeschylus Eumenides, Apollo defends his championship of Orestes by saying (725), 'Is it not just to benefit one's worshiper?' In this instance failure to preserve the worshiper is considered unjust. Injustice, while a more comprehensive term than ingratitude, does not necessarily include it. The one springs from a feeling that may be, and often is, as cold as ice. A Shylock can base his claim upon it. The other connotes a warm heart. A deed may be at once an act of justice and an act of gratitude. A man who performed it as an act of justice might conceivably desire it to be thought of as an act of gratitude. But the grateful man would feel his act debased if it were put on the plane of mere justice. There is a constant confusion of these two things⁹. Does a man owe gratitude for an act of common justice? Two of the commonest Greek terms for feeling gratitude originally meant to receive a favor or to be conscious of a favor received. Now, a favor may be an act of justice, but an act of justice can never be a favor.

From the dramatists various passages bearing on this subject may be cited. Sophocles makes Creon ask why the gods should take thought for the corpse of Polynices (Antigone 283). Would it be because he was a benefactor when he came to loot their temples? Here the new element is the use of what was destined to become the formal title *ελεγκτήρ*. Can a man be a benefactor of the gods and as such be eligible to receive their gratitude? Perhaps the question asked by Sophocles, through Cleon, merely implies the improbability that such a relation could exist in the case of Polynices, and does not in any way touch the question whether such a relation can ever exist. The words of Electra (Sophocles, *Electra* 1376-1383), when she prays Apollo to grant her a hearing on the ground of her lavish sacrifices to him, contain a veiled appeal to the divine selfinterest (1382-1383). She uses a phrase that suggests propitiation, and the sacrifices to which she refers may have been propitiatory. In Euripides, Hippolytus 1437-1438, Artemis leaves her dying votary, whose service to her had far surpassed the duties of ritual worship. Comparison with the conduct of Theseus (Hercules Furens 1398-1400) makes it probable that the poet intended to bring out the seamy side of the divine conduct, though to the average Greek the reason alleged by the departing goddess would doubtless seem adequate. In 1364-1369, Hippolytus complains that he is receiving an unworthy recompense for his piety to the gods and his services to men. But perhaps this is only the age-long complaint of man against the injustice that seems inherent in the constitution of things—a protest against injustice rather than against ingratitude.

The Heraclidae (766-768) presents something of a puzzle. The chorus of old men, left in town while the decisive battle rages without, express their confidence in Zeus, in words one clause of which, normally rendered, means, 'Zeus is justly grateful to us'. But for what? Is it for the protection afforded by Athens to

the suppliants who have fled for refuge to his altar? I have been able to find no passage where *χαρίν ἔχειν* is used with *δικαίως* or *ἐνδίκως* in any other sense than 'be grateful'. The translation of this passage in the Everyman's Library version renders the words in precisely the opposite sense: "The tribute of eternal praise From all that breathe to him is due". The translator evidently took *χαρίν ἔχειν* to mean 'has gratitude from me', that is, 'so far as I am concerned'. Way renders by "Zeus's favor is my right". The context calls for something like 'Zeus justly has the favor to his credit, so far as I am concerned'.

Aristophanes affords little that is pertinent to our subject. In the *Pax*, the chorus, working desperately to liberate Peace, urges Hermes not to tell on them (386), 'if you know that you've gobbled down a little pig offered for your gratification at my house'. This is a reminiscence, if not a parody, of *Iliad* 1.39, and does not go beyond it in the expression of gratitude, though, by this time, the implication may be quite other than anything Homer felt. Verses 378-379 are about on a par with it, but secure a comic touch by the addition of an oath-formula in parody. Nearly a quarter of a century later, in the *Plutus*, Hermes complains of his hungry condition, contrasted with his previous happy state. Cario replies (1124): 'And serve you right, for leaving me in the lurch on sundry occasions, when you had received such things from me', which implies that in accepting sacrifice from slaves the god bound himself in justice, if not in gratitude, to protect them from punishment.

Once more, this time in Plato (*Republic* 394 A), we hark back to *Iliad* 1.39. Plato seems to interpret this as a specific request for gratitude. The case, however, is not beyond dispute, because, for all we can tell, *χαρίν* may be used as a synonym for *ἐνεκα*. It seems, however, to retain at least something of its proper meaning: 'demanding payment, if ever he had given a pleasing gift, on account of which (?) he prayed that the Greeks might pay for his tears'.

Turning now to Latin writers, I can do no more than call attention to a number of passages where the gratitude of the gods is more or less clearly expressed or hinted at. Such are Plautus, *Aulularia* 23-28; Catullus 76.17-20; Horace, *Serm.* 2.6.6; Propertius 4 (5). 11. 100; Ovid, *Tristia* 3.3-5, *Met.* 15.122-126, 9.699-701. In *Met.* 9.701, we find the expression *ingratum numen*, Dryden's "thankless deity". Martial, addressing Domitian, says (5.1.7-8), *O rerum felix tutela salusque, sospite quo gratum credimus esse Iovem*. In Statius, *Thebais* 9.906, Parthenopaeus, in his dying speech, apostrophizes his absent mother and asks her to burn his arms, *vel ingratae crimen suspende Dianae*, i.e. 'or, if you will, hang them up as an indictment of Diana's ingratitude' (compare 7.784-785).

On what, then, is this hazy notion of the divine

⁹For the use of *δικαίως* with *χαρίν ἔχειν*, see Isocrates 426 A, 275 B, 246 D.

¹⁰In other places where Euripides uses the phrase *χαρίν ἔχειν* (*Alceste* 544; *Hercules Furens* 1352; *Suppliants* 1178), it clearly means 'to be grateful', but in *Suppliants* 374-375 we find a passage more nearly parallel to the one we are discussing. Here the words cannot mean 'be grateful', except in the sense 'be pleasing'. As Loew (*Χάρις*, 13) takes them. But our passage hardly bears this sense.

gratitude based? Is it a mere transference to god of a moral quality of man, due to his feeling that the gods must possess the finer qualities of human nature? It is just this, I think, when the gods are represented as grateful to one another¹⁰. In such cases the conveniences of human intercourse are transferred to divine society. But this is not the whole story, as we may see by comparing the practices and the ideas of a lower stage of religion. The existence of a fetish depends on the will of the worshiper. It may be set aside if it does not accord the worshiper the reward that is his due (Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 11.336). In the higher stage of ancestor-worship we may learn from Frazer (The Belief in Immortality, 285) what treatment is meted out to the ghost who fails to help his worshipers with their hunting: "If, after repeated warning, the ghost fails to do what is expected of him, they reproach him with ingratitude, taunt him with his uselessness, and leave him to starve. If this fails, they discharge a volley of abuse at his grave and trouble themselves about him no more". In the magical stage, the deity, of course, has no option, no will of his own in the matter. If the proper rite be properly performed, the god is obliged to do the act required of him. This he does, not because he is grateful for what he has received, for he may not have received anything of much account, but because he must.

A distinctly higher type of sacrifice is that represented by the formula *Do ut des*. Is not this a direct and frank appeal to gratitude? In an article entitled *Die do-ut-des Formel in der Opfertheorie*, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 20.241-253, van Leeuw emphasizes that function of sacrifice whereby the strength of the god is enhanced and he is endowed with increased power to grant the wishes of his worshipers¹¹. From this angle the formula would mean, not 'I give to you that you may be willing to give to me', but rather 'I give to you that your capacity for giving may be maintained'. If the god be thus dependent for any real existence upon the faithful performance of ritual, he might be supposed to be grateful to those who perform the acts whereby he lives and moves and has his being.

But, after all, such an idea, with its flavor of magic, belongs to a relatively early stratum of thought. It must have become fused into the usual meaning of *do ut des* at a relatively early date. It seems to me that in the notion of god's gratitude we have at least two elements. First, by these various types of ritual act, to which we may add the vow, the notion has become firmly fixed that man must receive return for his worship. Only in this way could sacrifice maintain itself. The average Job will not serve god for naught. He must get in return some blessing, negative, if not positive. Secondly, as man's own moral nature develops and he comes to recognize the duty of gratitude, and as, parallel with this, his view of his gods and of his relation to them develops along the lines of anthropomorphism and anthropopathism, he tends to explain

the duty of the gods to make return for worship as he would explain his own obligation to make return for gifts or favors accorded to him.

Even in a highly monotheistic religion like that of the Hebrews, the divine being is endowed with human attributes and feelings. But in the Greek religion, which discovered no impassable gulf between god and man, the relations of man to man and god to god were supposed to hold between man and god. As Kidd remarks¹², "the state was a fraternity in which the great immortals known as gods were members", and, if man has duties towards god, god has duties equally binding towards man. To the Christian religion, on the other hand, although it had adopted in part the Greek view of the essential affinity of god and man, the thought of any obligation of god to man for services received was quite foreign and impossible. Do whatever you may in the way of service to God, you cannot earn His thanks, any more than the servant who serves his master at meat expects thanks therefor¹³. With our best endeavors we are still unprofitable servants and we cannot earn χάρις from God, in the sense of gratitude or thanks. What we do receive from God is χάρις in quite another and quite opposite sense—grace, something unearned and unearnable (1 Corinthians 15.10; 2 Corinthians 8.9; Ephesians 2.5, 8).

These two extremes, then, we have—on the one hand the belief that god is, in a sense, the tool or servant of man, and, on the other, the notion that man is an undeserving weakling, and that his greatest efforts are by no means a fulfilment of even his minimum duty. Between these lies the stratum of thought that gives us the gratitude and the ingratitude of the gods. It is based on the characteristically Greek thought of the essential affinity of man and god—the same feeling that allowed the Greek to go so far in the practice of burlesquing his gods.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT

SCIENCE AND THE HUMANITIES

On August 4, 1917, there was published in The New Republic a review, signed merely "H. J. L.", of a book entitled *The History of Science*, by Walter Libby (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, \$1.75). The reviewer characterized the book as "one of the most effective pieces of scientific popularization it has ever been my good fortune to read; henceforth there is no one who can claim exemption from at least a bowing acquaintance with the general history of science. He writes with a simple lucidity that is often not without an eloquence of its own". The reviewer hopes also that the result of this book "will be to focus the attention of our Universities upon the possibilities of a course in the history of science".

There is much more in the review of interest and suggestiveness, but I have space to quote only the following paragraphs:

And equally clearly this volume suggests an important conclusion for those of us who are interested in

¹⁰These instances, many in number, do not fall within the scope of this paper.

¹¹He quotes little from classical literature in support of his position, but calls attention to the *maie esio* of Roman religion.

¹²*Principles of Western Civilization*, 172, note 2 (New York, Macmillan, 1902).

¹³Luke 17.7-10.

the part that science should play in the educational curriculum. One who, like myself, is a passionate believer in the virtue of a classical education, is yet lamentably constrained by honesty to admit that there are those for whom a training in classics is waste of time and misdirection of energy. Yet it is at least as clear that there are many for whom the intimate processes of science will always remain an unaccountable mystery, who, if they remained all their lives in a laboratory, would still be incapable of learning the wisdom it has to teach. There is no *a priori* reason why we should waste a Porson's time upon elementary chemistry; any more than it has been predetermined that an embryonic Darwin should drink in the secrets of Greek verse. Are we not guilty here of an unnecessary dichotomy? Most of us are willing to admit that an acquaintance with the achievement of science is fully as necessary as an acquaintance with the achievement of Greece and Rome. We do not propose to neglect Newton because we read Plato, or to make a choice between Darwin and Tacitus. We are willing, even anxious, to experiment with whatever is likely to illuminate for us the mysteries of life. Surely the bridge between the two attitudes is to be found in the adequate teaching of the history of science. I do not suggest that such teaching is likely to afford the same discipline in accuracy as a course in Latin prose or the differential calculus. I do not think it would be such a training in the appreciation of the *mot juste* as can be learned from the practice of Latin and Greek verse. No one who never looks through a microscope will ever learn to understand the glories of Schaudinn and imbibe therefrom the patience and the accuracy which the study of science so astoundingly achieves. But if we are to be honest we have got to admit that the complexity of science to-day renders it extremely unlikely that a year of elementary physics and one of very elementary chemistry will be any more productive of an understanding of the significance of science than a year of classics will conduce to an understanding of the beauties of, say, the choruses of Sophocles or the biting brevity of Tacitus. It is here surely that the value of the history of science is apparent.

For it gives to your man of affairs, who will be a professional student of no theoretical subject, to your embryonic lawyer or statesman or manufacturer, a sense of perspective that he will not otherwise attain. He will get an impressive realization of what is meant by the scientific interpretation of phenomena far better than if, for one hurried year, he measures volumes and calculates densities, and lights a match to determine the presence of oxygen. His imagination is far more likely to be stirred by such contact than by the painful memory of chemical formulae.

These two paragraphs constitute an equally effective plea for certain sorts of books which the lovers of the Classics have been issuing recently—such books as *The Pageant of Greece* (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.192), *The Legacy of Greece* (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.39-40), and the series *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*.

CHARLES KNAPP

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

IX

American Historical Review—January, Review, favorable, by M. Rostovtzeff, of F. Haverfield, *The Roman Occupation of Britain*; review, on the whole favorable, by Kirsopp Lake, of Elmer Truesdell Merrill, *Essays in Early Christian History*; review, favor-

able, by E. Emerton, of Preserved Smith, *Erasmus, A Study of his Life, Ideals, and Place in History*; review, favorable, by E. Emerton, of P. S. Allen and H. M. Allen, *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami*, Tomus V, 1522-1524; review, on the whole favorable, by Ralph Van Deman Magoffin, of R. A. L. Fell, *Etruria and Rome*.

Archäologische Anzeiger, 1922, Columns 238-345—Summary of archaeological discoveries in Greek lands in the years 1916-1922, with discussion of the more significant. B. Schweitzer.

Art and Archaeology—February, *The American Academy in Rome*, C. Grant La Farge [1 illustration]; *America in Ancient Rome*, Grant Showerman [14 illustrations]; *The Architect at the American Academy in Rome*, Gorham Phillip Stephens [1 illustration]; *The Painter at the American Academy in Rome*, Frank P. Fairbanks [3 illustrations]; *The Sculptor at the American Academy in Rome*, Paul Manship [2 illustrations]; *Some Portraits of Roman Empresses*, Guido Calza [10 illustrations]; review, favorable, by Mitchell Carroll, of Grant Showerman, *Eternal Rome, The City and its People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, 2 volumes; review, favorable, by W. H. Holmes, of George Grant MacCurdy, *Human Origins, A Manual of Prehistory*, 2 volumes.

Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bulletin of—January, *Recent Classical Accessions: Early Terracotta Sculptures and Vases* [four illustrations].

Newcomen Society (England), Transactions of the—Volume 2, 1921-1922, *Greek and Roman Engineering Instruments*, R. C. S. Walters [16 pages].

CHARLES KNAPP

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 178th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held at the Princeton Club, on Friday, February 13, 1925. Thirty-eight members and guests were present.

The paper of the evening was read by Dr. Nathaniel E. Griffin, of the University of Pennsylvania. The subject was *Greek Literary Forgeries*. Out of the wide field of such forgeries, of which a number of examples was cited, Dr. Griffin discussed in detail only *Dares Phrygius* and *Dictys Cretensis*.

Although these writings exist only in a Latin text, yet each is almost demonstrably a translation of an original Greek text. Indeed a fragment of the Greek text of *Dictys* exists in one of the *Tebtunis Papyri*.

After a brief sketch of the contents of each work, Dr. Griffin discussed their effect upon the periods following their publication, as well as upon the early Middle Ages. He ascribed the forgeries to opposition to the Homeric story, an opposition which was due to the rise of a rationalistic spirit and to disbelief in the ancient gods in an age that prided itself on its philosophical enlightenment and on its emancipation from the superstitions of the past.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*